



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,183	02/26/2002	Shingo Ishihara	500.41280X00	2432
20457	7590	07/10/2006	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873				MACCHIAROLO, PETER J
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2879

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/082,183	ISHIHARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J. Macchiarolo	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 58-64 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/05/2006.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The reply filed on 04/05/2006 consists of changes to the claims, and further, the reply consists of remarks related to the prior rejection of claims in the previous Office Action. The above have been entered and considered. However, pending claims 58-64 are not allowable as explained below.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 04/05/2006 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

Claim 64 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The claim recites a color filter is disposed between the organic EL electrode and the opposite substrate. However, there is lack of antecedent basis for “the organic EL electrode.” For the purpose of Examination, the Examiner interprets this as a typographical error and reads, “the organic EL substrate.” Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 58-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nishi (USPGPUB 20010004190; “Nishi”).

Regarding claim 58, Nishi shows in figures 1, 11a, and 11b an organic light-emitting display comprising: an organic EL substrate (fig. 1; #101) having a first electrode (105) formed on the organic EL substrate; an organic layer (107) formed on the first electrode (105); a second electrode (108) formed on the organic layer (107); and a plurality of pixels (best seen at figure 11a, #1001); a counter substrate (fig. 11b, #1004) formed adjacent the organic EL substrate (fig. 1; #101 corresponds to fig. 11b, 1000); and an light extraction layer (1006) formed between the organic EL substrate (1000) and the counter substrate (1004); wherein each of the plurality of pixels includes a plurality of sub-pixels (fig. 11b; pixel portion) and is disposed such that an auxiliary electrode (1008) is disposed in a part of one of the sub-pixels, wherein the auxiliary electrode is formed on a same level as the first electrode and is connected to a current supply line (1009) within a drive layer via an inter-layer insulating layer (not labeled in figure 11b, but corresponds to the material labeled #42 in fig. 2)

Regarding claim 59, Nishi discloses in paragraph 18 the plurality of sub-pixels comprises a red organic light-emitting layer, a green organic light-emitting layer and a blue organic light-emitting layer.

Regarding claim 60, Nishi shows in figures 1, 11a, and 11b a rib (1005).

The Examiner notes that the limitation, “for controlling a thickness of the light extraction layer” is an intended use type limitation. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Regarding claim 61, Nishi shows in figure 11b the rib is formed on the counter substrate.

Regarding claim 62, Nishi discloses in paragraph 161 the rib is formed of a glass or a photo-curing resin.

Regarding claim 63, Nishi shows in figure 11b the rib is formed on a sealing portion of the counter substrate and the organic EL substrate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over previously cited Eida et al (USPGPUB 20010050532; “Eida”).

Regarding claim 64, Nishi is silent to using a color filter.

However, Eida shows in figure 4 that color filters (11) are disposed between the organic EL substrate and the opposite substrate. Eida further teaches in paragraph 199 this configuration improves the color adjustment and contrast.

Therefore, in view of the above discussion, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Eida with the color filters of Eida to improves the color adjustment and contrast.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Macchiarolo whose telephone number is (571) 272-2375. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2475. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2879

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



KGuharay
KARABI GUHARAY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
6/27/06